

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10 and 22 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 6, and 7, and adds claim 20. These changes are supported by the specification. *See*, Examples I to III, wherein Examples III-1 to III-3 illustrate the thicknesses, 50 µm, 100 µm and 150 µm in Table 3. *See*, page 14, lines 13-24 which supports the feature of “examples of acrylic monomers to form the acrylic polymer include monomers having carboxyl groups and/or monomers having hydroxyl groups”. *See*, page 15, lines 24-25, which explains “the urethane polymer is formed by reacting a polyol and a polyisocyanate.” Further, new claim 20 is supported by Example III and Fig. 1A.

Thus, no new matter is added.

I. Claim Objections:

Claims 6 and 7 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 are hereby amended to remove any ambiguities.

II. Claim Rejections - § 112:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the Examiner rejects the claims for lacking support for the recitation “wherein the urethane polymer and an acrylic polymer are bonded together”. Applicant amends claim 1 to clarify this aspect of the invention. In the present invention, the urethane polymer and the acrylic polymer of this invention can be bonded together by performing a reaction of carboxylic groups or isocyanate groups derived from acrylic polymers with isocyanate groups. This reaction is

understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the specification (for example, see specification at pages 14-15).

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. Claim Rejections - § 103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagamoto et al. (US 6,156,423) in view of Ebe et al. (JP 62-153376) (which corresponds to Ebe et al. 4,756,968).

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 is the only claim in independent form; therefore, the following discussion is initially directed to this independent claim.

The Examiner has withdrawn the previous prior art rejection in favor of the combination of Nagamoto and Ebe.

The Examiner considers the barrier layer of Nagamoto to be equivalent to the claimed first film comprising a material different from that of the composite film. Nagamoto's barrier layer has a thickness of 0.1 to 40 μm , and more preferably of 10 to 30 μm for the purpose of preventing both the generation of fish-eyes and the bleeding of unacceptable ingredients (col. 5, lines 12-15).

In contrast, the first film of the invention has a thickness of 50 μm or more, therefore, the thickness range of the present invention does not overlap with that of Nagamoto.

Moreover, there is no motivation for modifying Nagamoto to have a barrier layer of the same thickness range of the present invention. Rather, the more preferable range of Nagamoto is to make the layer thinner (i.e., less than 30 µm) than the claimed invention, rather than to increase the thickness to more than 40 µm. Ebe provides no motivation for increasing the thickness of Nagamoto's barrier layer.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Nagamoto and Ebe.

B. Dependent Claims

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

Moreover, new claim 20 is patentable because the layer construction of the adhesive tape of Nagamoto is different from that of the adhesive sheet of the invention. In particular, the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer touches the composite film in the present invention. In contrast, Nagamoto's adhesive layer does not touch the film layer, but rather the barrier layer (col. 5, lines 57-67). Thus, the structural configuration of the claimed invention according to claim 20 is distinguishable from Nagamoto, either taken alone or in combination with Ebe.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No.: 10/625,527

Attorney Docket No.: Q76642

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ellen R. Smith/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Ellen R. Smith
Registration No. 43,042

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 13, 2010